

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

Thursday, September 3, 2015

Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street
Board Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada

And

Department of Education
9890 South Maryland
Board Conference Room
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(Video Conferenced)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Elaine Wynn
Dave Jensen
Anthony Martinez
Mark Newburn
Allison Serafin
Victor Wakefield

In Carson City:

Kevin Melcher
Freeman Holbrook
Teri Jamin
Dave Cook

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

Dena Durish, Director, Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement
Laurie Hamilton, Administrative Assistant

In Carson City

Steve Canavero, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement
Janie Lowe, Director, Education Programs
Blakeley Hume, Education Programs Professional
Katherine Rohrer, Education Programs Professional
Tracy Gruber, Education Programs Professional
Russ Keglovits, Education Programs Professional
Diane Mugford, Education Programs Supervisor

Peter Zutz, Director, Assessment, Data and Accountability
Leslie James, Education Programs Program
Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
Tom MacDiarmid, Education Programs Professional
Judy Osgood, Public Information Officer
Joyce Hilley, Educator Licensure Analyst
Lauren Hulse,
Shawn Osborne, IT Department
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Roseanne Richards, Clark County School District
Dale Norton, Superintendent, Nye County School District
Jeff Zander, Superintendent, Elko County School District
Bob Dolezal, Superintendent, White Pine School District
Brian Myli, Public Education Foundation
Josh Keating, Public Education Foundation
Ben Gerhardt, Nevada Virtual Academy
Andrea Klafter-Rakita, Assistant Chief Student Achievement Officer, Clark County School District
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE
Victoria Carreon, Guinn Center
Jason Lamberth
Kellie Ballard, Clark County School District
Seth Rau, Nevada Succeeds
Stephen Augspurger, Clark County Association of School Administrators
Spenser Stewart, WGU, Nevada Switch
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent Clark County School District
Heidi Arbuckle, Clark County School District
Dana Janson, Clark County School District
Denise Thistlewaite, Clark County School District
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association
Russell Fecht, Superintendent, Pershing County School District
Deb Hegna, Clark County School District
Beth Rubins, Las Vegas PBS
Michael Robison, University of Phoenix
Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council
Caroline McIntosh, Nevada Virtual Academy
Kipp Ortenberger, Las Vegas PBS
David Blodgett, Public Education Foundation
Anna Antolick, HOPE

Nick Sarisahin, Coral Academy
Steve Hansen, Superintendent, Lincoln County School District
Punam Mathur
Walk Hackford, Superintendent, Mineral County School District
Ryan Reeves, Academica
Sandra Sheldon, Superintendent, Churchill County School District
Betsy Giles, Clark County Education Association
Rodriguez Broadnax, Interim Superintendent, Esmeralda County School District
Susan Ortega, Superintendent, Lander County School District
Susannah Buckley, Clark County School District
Zach Stork, Clark County School District
Adam Johnson, Teach For America
Jhone Ebert, Clark County School District
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Wm Rob Roberts, Nevada Association School Administrators
Denette Corrales, Wells Fargo
Greg Wineman, Superintendent, Eureka County School District
Demetria Murphy, Teach For America

Carson City:

Kristen McNeill, Washoe County School District
Kirsten Gleissner, Northwest Nevada Regional Professional Development Program
Sandra Aird, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of State Superintendents
Todd Butterworth, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Scott Bailey, Washoe County School District
Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District
Jill Manitt, UNR Social Work

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

Public Comment #1

Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District (WSCD), commented on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). Recently WSCD received information and recommendations from the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) regarding changing the weights to an 80/20 percentage. She expressed concern about the change and how the scoring of the matrix is impacted by changing the weights. Ms. Anderson asked to consider deferring adoption of the weighted matrix to a future meeting to allow further consideration of the impact regarding the change in weights in scoring.

Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council, commented on school plans for the ZOOM schools. She said it is helpful the plans are accessible to all members of the public for review even though they are complicated. The reading skills development centers are very important in the ZOOM school plans. Reviewing these by a third party is important going into the third year to assure the methodologies used in both WSCD and CCSD are those that will work and provide results the legislature expects.

President Wynn announced the updates from CCSD and WCSD on the recruitment and retention of teachers that was requested has been deferred to the October meeting.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Member Serafin moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

President's Report

President Wynn welcomed two new board members. Dave Jensen, superintendent, Humboldt County School District has been appointed as the representative of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and Anthony Martinez has been appointed as the student representative.

President Wynn announced that Superintendent Erquiaga has been asked to join the Governor's staff as his chief strategy officer and his last day as the superintendent of public instruction will be September 4, 2014. He will continue to focus on education and workforce development in his new position.

Deputy Superintendent Steve Canavero will serve as the interim superintendent of public instruction during the transition and Janie Lowe will serve as the Deputy Superintendent. President Wynn re-capped some of the achievements made during the past two years with Superintendent Erquiaga at the Department of Education (NDE).

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Erquiaga conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation and provided an overview of the past two years as the state superintendent, including adopting regulations, testing issues and committing to the common core standards. A lot of work was about the vision, mission priorities and aligning the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) along functional areas rather than. The perception of the NDE has changed with new focus on outcomes. ZOOM schools have been introduced to help Nevada's English learners (ELs) and the needs to help underperforming students in the state are being addressed. Many federal issues have been dealt with including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver. The notion of a New Nevada includes almost \$1 billion to be invested in Pre-K through higher education with a system of many legislation pieces that were passed.

Superintendent Erquiaga said there are three areas ahead, implementation, evaluation and addressing chronic under performance and college and career readiness. The Board will spend much of the next two years on these three topic areas. He cautioned that work will need to be done in earnest for the next 18 months on the statewide system of accountability. There are tremendous challenges with data as a result of what happened with testing this spring. There is pressure to use the system of accountability to not just hold up information to improve public schools, focus on assessments needs to continue, and there have been many discussions about testing over the last two years. There is still no cohesive strategy for assessments in the public the public schools in Nevada. There is a collection of laws and requirements but they are not aligned.

Nevada law requires final revisions are made to the Nevada Plan for school finance. The plan was written in 1967 and this year the legislature processed a bill to revise the plan with a new formula. Superintendent Erquiaga further discussed chronic underperformance and college and career readiness. In about six weeks the report card given to schools about the school performance work must be issued. Scores from previous years are being carried over because of data shifting with the new smarter balanced test. This is not because of the data challenge with computers, but because there is a new base line.

Approval of Consent Agenda

Information concerning the following consent agenda items has been provided to Board members for study prior to the meeting. Unless a Board member has a question concerning a particular item and asks that it be withdrawn from the consent list, items are approved through one action.

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) President

a. Possible Approval of:

- Re-licensing of a Clark County Private School for a four-year period: Kids Campus Learning Center – Martin Luther King Boulevard
- Re-licensing of a Clark County Private School for a two-year period: D.H's Christian Academy
- Re-licensing of a Lyon County Private School for a two-year period: A Step Ahead
- Licensing of a new Washoe County Private School for a two-year period: Sterling Academy.

b. Possible Approval of Textbook/Instructional Committee findings from Eureka County School District

c. Possible Approval of the awarding of special education discretionary units to the following school districts and charter school authority for instructional programs during the 2015-16 year, as recommended by staff.

d. Possible Approval of July 23 SBE Minutes

e. Possible Approval of two new members to the Title I Committee of Practitioners to advise the State Education Agency on issues related to policies affecting children who are disadvantaged

- Karen Chessell, EPP for Family & Consumer Sciences, Nevada Department of Education
- Brian Prewett, Director, Title 1, Washoe County School District

Member Serafin moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action of awarding Great Teaching and Leading Fund grants (S.B. 474) of up to \$4.9 million in School Year 2015-16 for professional development in science standards; implementation of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF); recruitment, selection and retention of effective teachers/principals; and programs of leadership training and development.

Deputy Superintendent Durish informed the Board this item is about effective educators serving all students. This is the first time in Nevada that the Board and the NDE have played a role in the development of educators. A [PowerPoint](#) presentation was conducted providing an overview of the purpose, funding and administration, reporting and evaluation and the priorities, timeline and process over the next biennium for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF). An advisory task force will begin meeting later this month and will provide recommendations about statewide professional development to the Legislature.

Deputy Durish provided information about the entities that submitted applications for the GTLF funds. She explained this year is the implementation, evaluation and accountability of the program and built into the bill are two structures for evaluation and reporting. This funding for the GTLF came with a position, and there is a newly created division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement within the NDE. That staff person will begin after October 1, 2015.

The bill specifies priorities for which grants of money may be made from the GTLF for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 and they have been identified to include instruction in Science standards, implementation of the statewide performance evaluation system, and focus on recruitment, selection and retention training. The priorities are subject to change. The bill did not specify how much money was to go to each of the priorities.

The intent is to have the Program Effectiveness Report to the Board the end of October and followed up by the independent evaluation of grant funds awarded by December. Beginning with fiscal year 2016-17, on or before September 30 of each year, the Board is to prescribe the priorities for which grants of money may be awarded from the GTLF. The educator programs professional staff person will coordinate with the regional training program bodies for their priorities to assist in setting them for the upcoming year.

A review team representing teachers, administrators and education leaders was formed and met August 19 and 20, 2015. The group reviewed the 24 applications submitted and the recommendations have been provided. President Wynn requested that the two members from the review committee who were present share their impressions of the review team.

Seth Rau, Policy Director, Nevada Succeeds, states the shortest application of the 24 submitted was 20 pages, the longest 86 pages. Committee members poured through the applications and used the rubric to determine whether the applications aligned with the intent of the law. Applications that were not aligned were dismissed. Discussions were held about which programs would have the most impact on teachers and leaders in Nevada. Four goals were set by the legislature to assure science standards, the NEPF, increasing teacher pipeline recruitment and addressing leadership in the state were implemented.

Marilyn Dondero Loop shared that there was vigorous discussion over two days about awarding the money, the intent of the law and which programs to implement.

Deputy Durish provided a [spreadsheet](#) with details about the GTLF review team recommendations to fund and not to fund the applications.

President Wynn asked if the new Spending and Government Efficiency Commission for the system of K-12 (SAGE) will have oversight of the expenditure of the funds, and would they review this distribution as well. Superintendent Erquiaga explained SAGE is the commission to study public education in Nevada. The charge of that body is to look for efficiencies in educational spending and to make recommendations for possible improvements but they have not yet met.

President Wynn recognized the review team is the first group that has been charged with approving this distribution of money and they had to do it in a short time period. She inquired whether recommendations were made to pass on for the next series of evaluations to help fine turn the process when the new staff person is in place. Also, regarding accountability, she asked if there will be enough accountability to refine and improve the criteria.

Ms. Dondero Loop said yes, those discussions were held over the two day period. The intent of the bill was revisited many times as they asked, what did the intent of the bill say and how can the application be clearer? There were some applications that might have been good, but they did not meet all the intent of the bill. Accountability was also discussed and how to determine if the applicant followed the intent of the law.

Mr. Rau added the reason a few applicants could not be funded was because the program will be held accountable by the legislature in 2017. Some programs would still be going on at that time and it would be difficult to evaluate them because of limited activities in 2015-16. The committee decided on an emphasis to begin moving forward so when the third party evaluator is chosen they could begin evaluating programs and have actionable results when they come back next year and decide on the next round of teaching and leading fund applicants.

Superintendent Erquiaga added as priorities are set going into the next round, what the Regional Development Professional Programs (RPDPs) have established through their assessment will be considered to set priorities. He advised that less is more, and to be very targeted and clearer than in this bill and to not consider as many categories. There were applications for a little of this and a little of that. The more clear the needs of what the needs of the system will be in school year 2016-17, the easier the process will be.

Member Wakefield said he looks forward to working through the priority setting but would recuse himself from conversation and voting because his employer is an applicant for the grant.

Member Newburn commented that the make-up of the review committee was good, but he was surprised the committee what was charged with granting \$2 million for science professional development did not include a representative from the science or STEM community. He expressed concerns about the outcomes. Under the award only one charter school and no traditional public schools in the southern half of the state will receive professional development money for science under this award. In general, it appears there was about \$1 million of science professional development funds for southern Nevada that did not happen. He said is familiar with the process and that is not the issue

He had many discussions and is familiar with the process, and does not have an issue with the process, but the money was not awarded and the need for professional development in science is still there. Will those funds be there next year when priorities are set because it is still owed to the southern half of the state?

President Wynn asked if there was an outreach to the STEM coalition for participation on the committee. Deputy Durish said she appreciates Member Newburn's position and stated they were looking for people impacted by the results of the training and people that were familiar with effective high quality professional development. She debated several times about how to organize the committee and apologized there was not a person with a science background on the team.

Ms. Dondero Loop said as a member of the committee she represented all entities. She did not think she needed a science background, although she has a teaching background, because she was fair when reviewing the applications, including charter schools. She took the task of ushering all entities, not having a focus or a favorite, but doing what was right for the state.

Member Melcher commented whenever there is new legislation it is difficult to interrupt how it is to be implemented and then design the implementation. As a board, it is important to respect the work of the committee. He said he cannot make a motion, but recommended approval.

Member Serafin said has concerns about the process and setting a standard for what is expected moving forward. While reading the 34 applications it became challenging to reflect on the recommendations of the committee because it was not known how they scored each application, what was a strong application and what was not strong. Not having context from the committee prevented her from being able to gage how the decisions were made. She listed her concerns. There was not a framework to read with purpose resulting in questions about monetary decisions and questions about comments and feedback. It was unknown why one application was chosen over another and not having a scored rubric for each application, she did not have clarity about the process. Member Serafin expressed discomfort in supporting the recommendations by feeling a responsibility to obtain information objectively with evidence aligned to the rubric regarding how decisions were made to fund.

Mr. Rau appreciated member Serafin's comments. This was the first time for the process and Deputy Durish did an admirable job of creating a rubric, however first efforts are rarely perfect. Moving forward adjustments will be made to the rubric. The rubric captured most of the work, but there were additional factors.

President Wynn acknowledged her perspective as a business person is different than Member Serafin's as a former teacher and educator. She believes in assigning directives to staff and teams of citizens to research. To the interest she has in detail, it would be helpful and instructive to have it available for board members, however it does not prevent her from making a decision today based on this discussion.

Member Cook moved to approve the Great Teaching and Leading Fund reviews team recommendation for funding. Member Newburn seconded the motion. Member Serafin

voted nay. Member Wakefield abstained. Member Holmes-Sutton was absent. Members Cook, Holbrook, Wynn and Newburn voted yea. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Approval of Scoring Ranges for Nevada Educator Performance Framework Educational Practice Category and Application for Alternate Evaluation System/Tools.

Deputy Durish provided background on A.B. 447 that impacted the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) implementation. The Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) makes recommendations to the Board for approval. In addition, the Board is required to adopt policies and programs for the establishment of a system, which has 4 rating levels as defined by statute. Each teacher and each building level administrator in the state will have one of four ratings; highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective. The Board is also to include criteria for making those designations. Today the focus is on educational practices that include two components that make up educational practice score.

Dr. Pam Salazar, chair, Teachers and Leaders Council provided a [PowerPoint](#) presentation regarding the range of scores that will identify the final summative rating that defines the ratings for both administrators and teachers. She summarized the process for setting the range of scores on a scale of 1 to 4.

- Highly Effective 3.60 – 4
- Effective 2.80 – 3.59
- Minimally Effective 1.91 - 2.79
- Ineffective 1.0 – 1.90

Examples of the rating system were based on recommendations from the TLC. The system will continually be reviewed over time by the TLC and recommendations will be provided annually to the Board.

Member Serafin asked any schools districts would like to comment on in the decision today. Dr. Salazar responded to a reference made earlier from WCSD regarding the weightings for instruction and professional responsibilities stating that is not part of the decision today. Those concerns will be discussed later during a regulatory workshop. Deputy Durish explained the determination today is regarding the summative scoring cutting points. This number will only occur at the end of the academic school year.

Lindsay Anderson, WCSD, clarified earlier comments were made in regards to the range. The WCSD has a Board Trustee on the TLC who opposed the recommendations of the ranges however Ms. Anderson is not encouraging the Board to take a position for or against.

Member Serafin moved to approve the recommended score range. Member Newburn seconded the motion. Member Cook and Member Holbrook voted nay. The motion carried. Ms. Durish informed the Board the second part of this item is regarding the application. Nevada law specifies a school district may apply to use a Performance Evaluation System and tools that are different than those prescribed in the NEPF. *The application must be in the form prescribed by the State Board and must include, without limitation, a description of the evaluation system and tools proposed to be used by the school district. The State Board may approve use of the*

proposed evaluation system and tools if it determines that the proposed evaluation system and tools apply standards and indicators that are equivalent to those prescribed by the State Board.

If the Board is going to approve an alternative system, it is incumbent on the Board to approve a form that applicants will use to demonstrate equivalent to those prescribed by the State Board. A form has been provided that demonstrates the information. Ms. Durish provided information and details about the form.

Member Wakefield commented that as a state it is important to be clear but also give districts the flexibility about how to get there. He said the form is a great example of that, it ensures alignment at the state level but encourages districts to use the tools and resources and their own leadership in the best way they see them

Member Wakefield moved to approve the form for districts to submit their applications. Member Serafin seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action concerning the minimum number of school days that must take place before certain examinations may be administered and the period during which they are to be administered.

Deputy Canavero informed the Board that S. B. 75 requires the State Board to establish the minimum number of instruction days prior to the assessment. The assessments are for the Criterion References Tests in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 through 8. When the testing window is established it is uniformly applied across the state. One of the issues that came up during the legislative session is that the window does not work well for multi-track districts and different calendar configurations.

The minimum instruction days were set at 120 days, which is consistent with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium's (SBAC) policy that 66 percent of the instructional calendar be complete prior to the administration of the SBAC assessment. The constraints are presented in the provided [table](#). He explained the process used by the NDE and CCSD staff to determine dates. The suggestion and recommendation to the Board is to approve 120 days as the minimum number of instructional days that must pass prior to the assessment window.

Member Serafin moved to approve 120 days as the minimum number of school days from to the administration of the assessments. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion concerning the state assessment contract, the transition from Measured Progress to CTB/McGraw Hill, and an update on state readiness to administer the Smarter Balanced Assessment in Spring 2016.

Deputy Canavero introduced a new member of the team, Peter Zutz, recently hired as the administrator for the Office of Assessment, Dale and Accountability Management.

An overview was provided for the Board. The Board has been involved in discussions related to SBAC and Measured Progress (MP) and the roll out of the assessment last year. Subsequently, an RFP was initiated for a new vendor In January before the challenges in the assessment occurred. Every four to five years the NDE goes through the purchasing procedure to re-contract with vendors. There are two components to delivering the SBAC, the agreement with the

Smarter Balanced assessment consortium, similar to an HOA, an inter-local agreement, as well as a contract with Measured Progress. Now now that contract is with DRC. The original awardee of the contract was CTB, McGraw Hill and subsequent to that DRC purchased CTB. There have been many activities related to wrapping up the former contract with Measured Progress which finalizes the administration of the CRT. One aspect of good news, a settlement was reached with MP. The Nevada Attorney General's office issued a press release about the pre-litigation settlement. This concludes the ongoing negotiations related to the breach of contract. A resolution with SBAC is ongoing. Administrator Zutz and his team have been managing the transition with MP, and from MP to DRC, transitioning from a vendor that has been serving the state for about ten years to a new vendor with a sense of urgency. The HSPE sunsets and must be delivered in October.

There are still no scores for students who took the SBAC in English language arts and/or math last year. It was anticipated the scores would be received in mid-August, that was changed to the end of August but the scores have not been received yet. Administrator Zutz discussed the various aspects of the SBAC settlement. An important question to consider is to what extent did the technology challenges affect the validity and reliability of student scores? Also, an analysis, or the impact study, that will help understand what those scores mean has not been received yet. Information is being sent to the school districts to help communicate with parents and constituents regarding the questions of when will the scores be available and what do they mean. Deputy Canavero announced updates will be provided at future board meeting about Nevada's readiness to deliver computer adaptive tests in the spring.

Member Holbrook asked about the end-of-course timeframe and scores. Deputy Canavero responded the score reports should be available around January will be brought to the board for discussion.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action with school district representatives concerning administration of school year 2015-16 ACT test pursuant to NRS 389.807.

Member Jensen explained today he is representing the Nevada Association of State Superintendents as president, and also in his capacity as superintendent of Humboldt County School District. He invited superintendent colleagues to join him as he provided introductory comments. The superintendents will share measures and processes that are being implemented within their districts to address the issue of the ACT performance. The board is aware that the 2014-15 school year was the first broad based administration of the ACT to all 11th graders. The overall composite score for district averages led to a discussion with the school superintendents at their meeting last month. At that time most of the districts had not yet received their materials and were unable to have a discussion. The charge was made and homework assigned that they review their individual data and then begin to solicit comments and thoughts that could be brought to the State Board for discussion on the remediation and to address the performance in this group.

In reviewing collected information, individual districts began to reflect and compile questions including what to implement in the districts and how to quickly identify students that require remediation. As ACT has demonstrated scores or thresholds for college readiness, those are being used as the basis.

Crystal Abba, from the Nevada System of Higher Education made a presentation to the superintendents group and introduced NROC, which is an extension of Education Ready. The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) purchased rights for all 11th and 12th graders, and it is very detailed and specific. The math component was reviewed and is a measure that can be used as a remediation component. It is now available to all districts. Another area is enhancing the awareness of the importance of the ACT test and assuring students, staff and community know the value and the potential impact. There have been students who did not think they were college material, and as a result of their ACT performance are now rethinking that. Another issues discussed is implementing 12th grade conditions. If a student has obtained all their credits and met the proficiency requirements, the ability to not attend an entire school day is available in most districts. Research indicates that is not the most advantageous scheduling. Last, there is an enhanced focus on core instruction.

Pat Skorkowsky, superintendent, Clark County School District (CCSD) said this is an important time to move district goals of college and career readiness forward. The senior year needs to be about either remediation or acceleration, not hibernation. College and career centers are being expanded in CCSD to catch students in high school and provide options to graduate high school. Messaging why it is important to take the ACT test is essential to help prepare for the next step. Also assuring rigor is there for the freshman and sophomore year so when students become juniors they are prepared for the assessment. Superintendent Skorkowsky said business partners have commented they get students as interviewees who do not know how to write a resume, fill our applications or interview for a job. Possibly a senior seminar needs to be about financial literacy and job preparation skills for students who do not meet the minimum requirements of an ACT and need to learn how to navigate an adult world. Taking the ACT is a rite of passage and is important for students to understand it is not just for certain kids, it is for every student and can open opportunities for students to be successful. Remediation programs will be put in place and work key goals will be set up to help identify student needs.

Traci Davis, superintendent, Washoe County School District (WCSD) expressed excitement about their partnership with higher education at UNR and TMCC and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for sharing data. Sharing data allows insight about what is occurring with remediation. There is an opportunity to build additional high school prep initiatives to ensure students are receiving interventions as needed. It is a good continuum with higher education so it is fluid with K-12 as students move forward to a pre K-16 institution. There are data nights at the Boys and Girls club and also at local churches for parents to bring in data profile sheets to analyze where their kids are on the spectrum to graduate. Mentors are provided in the community for kids. It is a challenge with some kids, who think the tests are not meaningful because they think they are not going to college. There is excitement about data and the collaborative effort.

Wayne Workman, superintendent, Lyon County School District, stated a few years ago the board of trustees voted to adopt the battery of assessments that ACT offered, now called the Aspire. That test has been administered to students for the past few years and has been an excellent data point to use in conjunction with other assessments as how to guide instruction. Each of those years of administration has seen an increase of the composite score on the ACT which shows the teachers and administrators are cognizant of the exam and standards that must be achieved. In addition, they have students who have gone to college because they took the ACT where they

otherwise would not have. He thanked the Board for adopting the ACT because he has students that prove it changes lives.

Member Jensen said the superintendents have a few suggestions. They have discussed going to phase two of Nevada Ready which may be a strong awareness campaign which could encompass the ACT as they reach out to students, parents and the community to help understand how vitally important the ACT measure is. In addition, another suggestion is to re-convene the Graduation Sub-Committee to discuss expectations for seniors and graduation. It is a pivotal time for that discussion. Finally, relative to the ACT itself, as a collective group of superintendents they fully support the ACT and think it is an important measure for college readiness. He emphasized the superintendents representing the 17 counties and the Charter School Authority are eager to engage in the discussion. They take pride of what happens in their districts and the state.

Member Serafin commented in regards to career readiness that employers want an employee that has reading, writing and logic skills that are demonstrated on the ACT, in addition there are there are technical skills to make students competitive. She said she wants to be sure that career readiness is an expectation of college readiness.

Student Representative Martinez said he appreciated the discussion about awareness for students. He said seniors are not studying in their textbooks, rather they are online. Some students do not know how to fill out forms, or how to put together a resume and providing tools to help would be beneficial. He commented that most juniors did not know why they were taking the ACT. Some students studied for the test and some did not. The test results all of a sudden hit students with the awareness that they would be going to college in a year. When students learned where they were ranked from taking the test, they wanted to go above and beyond. Creating awareness for students that are not honor or AP students will help them to achieve. Students want to be ready for life.

Member Wakefield asked for feedback and said the NDE is engaging in a new look at the Nevada School Performance Framework, and said he sees utility in including the ACT aggregate score by school in the NSPF. Currently the participation rate is measured. It would help set the bar at the right level. If students are not required to pass a EOC exam, or transitioning out of one testing system to another one.

Member Jensen agreed the composite score could create danger especially when considering the lowest performing schools. The significant discrepancy between his Lowery High School and McDermott combined school, which is identified as a focus school at 90 percent Native American and deals with significant cultural and poverty issues. Composite scores would be difficult to provide incentive for McDermott. The one thing of interest is the growth, what growth is McDermott combined school going to make as they look at their bench mark, what will they do to improve their performance. He said to consider not the composite, but to measure what is expected of all schools, which is growth.

Ms. Davis, said WCSD had two performance frameworks and they use the states framework and a different one internally with is more rigorous including AP courses, higher diplomas and being more intent they are assuring more rigor and relevance. There is concern about the composite

score, and there are other indicators that show growth is being made and meeting criteria to assure kids are ready for college and career.

Mr. Skorkowsky said that measuring what they expect is important and was noted as the school performance framework came out for high schools and they looked at AP courses and then changed it to the pass rate. There was a 22 percent increase including all the minority sub groups over a three year period. Usually when scores drop because more kids are taking the test, they have an 18 percent increase in students scoring 3,4,5 on the AP exams and were named the large urban district by the College Board. If you expect it, and measure it, things happen. That is what is important. They included the AP participation and pass rate and the other is looking at the career and tech and experiences. They have schools that measure the number of kids that complete the career tech ed experiences as having classes in their sophomore, junior and senior year and coming out with that certificate so they can take it with them to higher ed or the work place. He said using the metric of growth a more suitable measure as opposed to a composite score. Their growth has increased every year, although the figures are small.

President Wynn extended an invitation for the superintendents as an association to address this topic and provide recommendations the NDE can incorporate in to the work being done with testing.

Member Jamin said he was her understanding that part of the reason they selected the ACT was the key works component, which is related to career readiness. She inquired if that is still the case, and she asked if the Aspire of the ACT includes career readiness. It is important not to add another test to address that.

Deputy Canavero said through DETR a pilot for the work keys program was made available, but there was little traction to take up the offer to use them in addition to the ACT core with the writing, which the Board approved. They just met with ACT and they will begin to produce on their ACT test they will institute on their score in the future, the next round, an indicator of a work key score on the ACT test. They have looked at students who have taken the Act and work keys and have made correlations. When a student receives a score back they will get an indication of their level on the work keys administration. It provides additional information for students and families.

Information and Discussion regarding Zoom Schools and the establishment of Zoom School performance levels pursuant to S.B. 405 from the 78th Regular Legislative Session.

Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional, informed the Board the purpose of the report is to provide an update on the report that was submitted to the Board and LCB on August 17 and briefly discuss the changes in S.B.504 in place for the last two year and S.B. 405. And to seek the Boards direction in providing proposals regarding the performance levels and outcome indicators related to S.B. 405. Statute specifies the timeline of collecting and submitting data. The process was to request districts submit through the state's consolidated application process the plan for the district as well as the school plans to be uploaded into the system.

Some of the changes from S.B. 504 over the last biennium to S.B. 405 include, the legislature made a significant investment in increasing the funding for S.B. 405. Previously it was a two year investment; a total of \$50 million was doubled. Over the next two year that will be \$100 million to support both the ZOOM schools and other districts and charter schools who serve

English learners also. This has resulted in increasing the number of schools identified as ZOOM schools. Last year 16 elementary schools were served in CCSD, and that has been increased this year to 26 elementary schools, 2 middle schools and 1 high school. The allocation to CCSD for the 2015-2016 school year is over \$39, 350, 00. In WCSD for the 2014-15 they served eight elementary schools. This new school year they will serve 14 elementary and one middle school. Their allocation is \$6, 985.00. The allocation for the rest of the districts and the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) is \$3, 613, 00.

There was also a significant change in statute which allowed for the elementary ZOOM schools to provide additional programs and services beyond the four core programs that were identified in S.B. 405, provide for pre-kindergarten programs, expand full day kindergarten programs, operate reading centers and to provide a summer or inter-session academy. The elementary school that are identified as Zoom schools must continue to implement those four, but in addition are required and allowed to address professional development, offer recruitment and retention incentives discussed in the July meeting, and engage families and parents of children who are EL in their educational system. Another significant expansion is the move into secondary schools. The law required WCSD to identify at least one secondary school and CCSD to identify additional secondary schools.

The ZOOM secondary schools are not required to implement each of the programs and services outlined by statute, but are allowed to choose one of more of those services and as with the elementary schools there is a limit on the amount of ZOOM funding that can be spent for professional development, incentives for recruitment and retention and family engagement to a total of 2 percent of those funds. That 2 percent cap can be a challenge in making an investment in those areas. In addition in the number of schools served by both CCSD and WCSD, they anticipate in the second year of the biennium, they will be able to increase the number of schools or services that during this first year the amount of money from the S.B. 405 funding that is needed for full day kindergarten, those funds will be covered through further state allocations in the second year of the biennium freeing up funds to either bring additional schools or increase services.

Member Wakefield asked for clarification because there seems to be two concepts at the same time. One is additional ability to spend in creative ways, and then any additional categories can only spend two percent of the funds. Mr. Wilson responded for the elementary ZOOM schools, although they were given the authority to use some of the ZOOM school funding for professional development for the incentives for recruitment, retention and family engagement, that two percent cap in law means they can think about it but they must find other sources of funding. This is one area where the ZOOM legislation than the Victory School legislation which did not set a two percent cap as the schools look at their needs and develop their plans.

Mr. Wilson provided a brief context of the role of the State Board to establish performance levels and performance indicators. Section 13 of the statute states *the Board shall prescribe statewide performance levels and outcome indicators to measure the effectiveness of the programs and services for which money is received by the school district and charter schools as part of this.* The recommendations today are to give ideas of thoughts, but want to make sure as we focus our develop of those recommendations and come back to you the timeline is November, we want to make sure we are going in a direction that is in accordance with the Board's desires.

Those performance level and outcome indicators must measure annually how well schools are doing, that they are to look at the development of EL proficiency and academic performance, and wherever possible that there be a comparison with non-ZOOM schools. Also, that those performance levels and outcome indicators that the Board will develop, are also to become part of a criteria through which the state will notify schools if they are not implementing the programs and services as agreed upon, or if their performance is below the state expectation.

Mr. Wilson provided recommendations for the Board to consider for direction. Representatives from CCSD and WCSD would like to provide input in the process. They want to ensure the unique nature of the ZOOM schools is understood. Many EL students are highly mobile attending up to 2-3 schools within a given school year which has an impact on how students learn and how accountability is measured. Schools that have the highest percentage of EL are already identified as ZOOM schools, to identify other schools that are comparable will be a challenge. As the Board establishes the performance levels this will be an ideal time to align state priorities with informing federal accountability in the same areas. For years there have been specific requirements under the heading of Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMOA). For EL there are three that are focused on, 1. AMOA measures what percentages of students are achieving at least one level of growth or increase in English proficiency over the given school year. 2. AMAO measures what percentage of students are attaining English proficiency and would successfully exit programs that serve EL. 3)How well are EL doing academically when looking at EL and math compared to their peers who are not EL.

1. Increasing in English proficiency
2. Attaining English proficiency
3. Achieving academic success

It is important to measure growth. This would allow accounting for where students start in EL and their academic performance and then measuring the impact of the school and instructional processes. The Board is encouraged to look at that as a significant way we consider accountability for ZOOM schools. In addition to that, we would like the board to consider, we often times are evaluated based only on the students who are EL currently. We often forget we have already served EL and helped them to achieve success and they are in the education system. He encouraged the Board to allow to look at data for all current EL and former EL. Are the supports we have in place when exiting services for EL having a continued impact on positive student outcomes, and schools get credit for that. That is very important. In establishing the performance and outcome indicators that there is a critical need to look at the data. Look at how students are doing so when performance levels are set seeking high levels of achievement while recognizing a starting point.

Nevada is part of the WIDA consortium and he said there will be the opportunity to look outside of Nevada to see how EL across the country are doing. There are 34 states working with the same English proficiency standards and assessments. We could learn how Nevada students are doing compared to other states. The key assessments that would be a good starting point will be the WIDA assessments that are in place and measure English language proficiency and also whatever measures the state is using that align with the Nevada Academic Content Standards. Moving ahead with SBAC and other assessments, those are what we would use. This would allow us to measure against Nevada's Content Standards and how well EL are doing.

Moving forward we will look at the best way to report and compare data. We need to look at what is the intended outcome from the Board in terms of performance and outcome indicators. Is it accountability or do we want to ensure the measures encourage improvement. If we take into account where schools are starting, do we build in measures that allow them to be identified for success in making progress towards the standards if they start out far below. Our early data shows in terms of the ZOOM, it is having a huge impact in the early grades, kindergarten and first grade. It is too soon to see if that will spill over to the upper grades, which is a goal. Are students reading by the third grade should be part of what we are looking at.

In summary, as we move forward, we would like to look at Nevada data, other state data, our current measures and where we want to go. We hope to align those with the current AMAOs but define those in ways that better meet Nevada's needs and we would involve local school districts and community representatives in drafting and refining those to bring those back to you.

Superintendent Erquiaga asked if there has been discussion about data related to how long a student remains served versus transitioning out. Statute now requires the NDE to collect information about long-term El. The discussion about modification to the Nevada Plan has had some predication on that weight may only last for a period of time to incent districts to move a student appropriately and not let them languish. Has length of time come up?

Mr. Wilson responded that length of time has come up. Traditionally there are not a lot of students exiting the program in very early years because they have not developed sufficient language to exit. Also, there is a problem in the middle and high school level, for long term El that get stuck at some of the middle levels of proficiency. We would like to identify the situation and how can it be addressed.

President Wynn commented that the ZOOM collaborative as identified that we recognize the unique nature of ZOOM schools because of the transiency nature, and she suggested it is not just ZOOM schools that have a transiency issue. It appears that whenever reports are done that is ample opportunity to footnote and explain how there may be some extenuating circumstances that could be interrupted along with the results. We can make that go away as a real concern by acknowledging that transiency itself is a problem with many of our schools. The query about how our former learners are doing might address more pedagogy as the kids are advancing and as stated they become somewhat language proficient, go on to higher grades, and then begin to stumble. Are they stumbling because they still have language barriers or is it the way in which they are taught in a ZOOM school, that academically differs from a more traditional pedagogy in the higher grades. That would be of interest to know. In view of earlier conversations to the degree that you provide the backup work and information gathering that goes into the decision making and reflections and recommendations so that when we do the research in our materials we can see how you have arrived at the recommendations you are advancing to us, that would be helpful.

Member Wakefield wanted to illustrate he has learned about from people that work with ZOOM schools and advocates, specifically to the idea of performance framework. At its best out performance framework does not capture the power of ZOOM schools because the investments are made in early grades and the performance framework incentives progress in grades 3,4,5. At

its worst, our performance framework has an incentive for top teachers to go the tested subject areas in grades 3,4,5. There is an opportunity aligned to the read by three assessments, where early literacy assessments are received throughout the state to ensure that informs our school performance framework and something we can actually see the progress in early literacy in schools we are making investments like ZOOM schools. He asked if the discussions or the alignment between how we define our early literacy assessments, required by read by three, and make sure it is part of this aligned system and we are able to compare how ZOOM schools with these investments doing on something we believe in that is normative compared to schools that are not getting investments.

Member Serafin asked if there is a baseline of when children enter EL programs and how long they are in the program. When she taught in Houston, the district was concerned about students who were EL students K-5 and entered middle school as an EL student they would enter high school as EL and they began to create strategies to incentivize work to determine how much more time they needed for instruction. The district began to analyze how long student were in EL programs and then implemented plans beginning in elementary school to ensure that if a child was in a program for three years, then a team would meet to discuss the needs of the child. She asked if Nevada is working on a similar strategy for an exit plan. Mr. Wilson acknowledged that they are in the process of gathering that data to determine at what point to students enter and at what proficiency level, and how quickly they develop proficiency and triggers of where to be concerned with students that are not achieving proficiency in an expected timeline. He confirmed that data would be shared with the board when it is available.

President Wynn asked how the shortage of TESL teachers is being addressed? Mr. Wilson said part of that is among the other issues that the EMC council has been working on, They are scheduled to come back to the Board in October or November with an update. At a recent meeting the Board requested they gather the research about the decisions they have been making, and that would be part of that information.

Member Serafin said in addition to analyzing the timeline of when the children are in EL programs, if the trends could be defined, specifically schools that have a high percentage of EL students that are successfully exiting EL programs and also what is the percentage of TESL certified teachers at those schools. Member Wakefield added it he would like to know if some of the schools have teacher vacancy issues. Member Serafin said she would like to know the cost per student for all of the ZOOM work this year. Going into the 2017 legislation session and thinking about the Nevada plan and keeping an eye on the target for what initiatives are costing per pupil.

Member Jamin recognized family engagement is important and students that have English as their second language and she asked if schools are able to come up with supplementary funds and why kind of family engagement activities they are currently conducting.

Superintendent Erquiaga stated the Legislature dug into the spending in the prior biennium on ZOOM schools to address the family engagement question. Title I funding has been used at these schools for parent and family engagement. Also, for professional development with some federal Title money, actually what the Legislative committee did with their finance staff, is they brought Washoe and Clark county to the table, asked questions about how much has been spent, totaled

the percentage and set that in the law. That figure represents prior year spending, but that does cordons off the state dollars, but there are other dollars available. This was out of concern from members who had participated in the development of the original ZOOM bill in 2013 that we had arrived at a formula that works in pre-school, kindergarten, intersession and another prescribed interventions and that we ought not go too far afield from that formula. We will report back how much was actually spent.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the requirements of Senate Bill 511 of the 78th Regular Legislative Session. S.B. 511 requires that the Board approve the distribution of money to the boards of trustees of local school districts to provide financial incentives to new hired teachers in certain schools. The Board will receive information concerning school district programs prepared pursuant to NRS 391.168 and may allocate funds based on applications from some or all school districts in accordance with those plans.

Deputy Durish reminded the Board at the last meeting they were presented each districts initial proposal for the S.B 511 funds. Ten districts submitted initial requests, and those districts will receive their funds soon. Four districts requested an extension in the process.

- White Pine and Nye County submitted plans and their recommended allocations were calculated based on \$4,000 per teacher. Board approval is recommended
- Esmeralda and Mineral County are waiting for final program approval. It is recommended the Board approve but their funds would not be released until the completed plans were received.

Member Serafin moved to approve the distribution of money to the board of trustees of White Pine, Nye, Esmeralda and Mineral County School District. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding revisions to Nevada's Parent Involvement policy pursuant to NRS 392.457. The Board will hear a brief presentation and review state policy recommendations from the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement and Family Engagement.

Deputy Durish reviewed NRS related to the Parent Involvement and Family Engagement (PIFE) Advisory Council and conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation. The PIPE council was established in 2007 and the office was added in 2012. The Advisory Council recently reviewed the existing policy which was last reviewed by the Board in 2001. A comprehensive study was conducted of other state policies and reviewed existing Nevada district policies.

Danette Corrales, Advisory Council, highlighted the major differences from the existing policy is that they are aligning with the current PTA language. Active verbs were added to the policy language to assure the state is in line with the process. The policies and practices the schools are being asked to consider through this policy include families and communities as a whole, just as the PTA standards do.

President Wynn re-stated the policy reflects the PTA recommendations language and said in reviewing other policies with various districts, she asked if there are consistent with what the districts are doing, and do the districts agree this is the standard to which all 17 districts should

aspire to. Ms. Corrales responded, for the most part, they are consistent. She had the opportunity to do a spread sheet of the policies for each of the 17 counties and there were a couple of policies they were not able to access. Ms. Durish contacted those district superintendents for a follow-up. Some policies are broader, some are narrow, but by and large, this is inclusive of work being done at the district level. President Wynn commented in order for this policy to be effective it must filter down to the grass roots of parents and families. Otherwise it is just a piece of paper. Ms. Corrales said the office has reached out to the family engagement coordinators in each district on a regular basis. When there has been a turn over within that position at a district level, they are communicating the importance of having not just the policy and the practice is equally important in. The dialog is continuing and being enhanced. Deputy Durish explained the intent moving forward, stressing a bullet in her presentation, *review any effective practices carried out in individual school districts to increase parental involvement and determine the feasibility of carrying out those practices on a statewide basis.* The first step was to update the policy, then review the practices and *identify the matter in which the level of parental involvement family engagement affects the performance, attendance and discipline of students.* The intent is take this as a launching step and move forward. Ms. Corrales stressed the importance of inviting all districts through the cycle and present to the Parent Involvement Advisory Council as to what they are doing within the districts and to ensure implementation at the school level.

Member Serafin moved to approve the policy. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the procedure for conducting a hearing for a school official submitting an appeal to the State Board of Education claiming reprisal or retaliatory action taken in response to a disclosure of information concerning an irregularity in testing administration.

Nevada Revised Statutes 391.624 declares it to be the policy of this state that a school official is encouraged to disclose, to the extent not expressly prohibited by law, irregularities in testing administration and testing security, and it is the intent of the Legislature to protect the rights of a school official who makes such a disclosure. The State Board must adopt rules of procedure for conducting a hearing as requested by a school official.

Deputy Canavero provided an overview of the procedures for a state school official to disclose irregularities in testing administration and testing security and to protect the rights of a school official who makes such a disclosure. This is about protecting the integrity of assessments and affording teachers and administrators with due process protections to ensure they are comfortable reporting test irregularities without fear of retaliatory actions.

The State Board must adopt rules of procedure for conducting a hearing requested by a school official. Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott suggested the procedures follow those procedures related to the suspension of a teacher's license. He provided guidelines for the Boards consideration.

Deputy Canavero explained if the Board conducts hearing and a determination is made that retaliatory action occurred. The extent of the Board's authority is to direct the proper person to dissect and refrain in such action. Deputy Canavero addressed some questions from Board members. The meetings must adhere to the Open Meeting Law, unless requested to be closed,

and will be recorded. A notice to move forward with the hearing is not required but recommended to be between 10 and 20 calendar days. It is not required but recommended the names are included along with the allegation of retaliation on the agenda. It is also recommended the Board determine the time duration of the hearing.

President Wynn observed this is a housekeeping piece of business with the Board wanting to be prescriptive. Considering further language, she suggested they return with the proper language reflected with the additional comments made.

Member Cook said in American jurisprudence, accusers have always had the right to face their accusers. What does it mean if the informant is not required to come forward? Deputy Greg Ott responded these proceedings are quasi-judicial because it is not of criminal nature and it is a fact finding mission. There will be one person who feels they have been retaliated against, asking for the Board to make a finding that the retaliation has in fact occurred. That retaliation may have come from another individual or entity. The procedures contemplate giving that other entity notice to come forward and defend themselves against the allegation that is being brought forth. The person who feels who feels they have been retaliated against would also have notice to come forward and present their case. Both parties would have the opportunity to show up and defend themselves.

Member Cook asked about a situation where someone has provided information that another education professional has manipulated the testing process. In turn that person is accusing the original informant of a vindictive act. Deputy Attorney Ott responded the procedure this has designed is not necessarily for someone who has been manipulating tests. It is for someone who believes they have reported an irregularity and something wrong occurred. And then they have had some kind of retaliation taken against them. They have been assigned different classes or they have been transferred unfairly. They feel as though they have been persecuted for being a whistle blower. They would identify the person who brought that wrong against them and that person would be given an opportunity. An actual testing regularity would be investigated by the NDE and would not come before the Board. Member Cook confirmed this about a general whistle blowing protection. Deputy Ott concurred.

Member Melcher said regarding the person who felt retaliation action was taken against them for being a whistle blower, he expressed concern that holding an open meeting, that person may feel persecuted again having to go through it again in public. He asked to look at that further. He said the shorter time period would be good to allow the situation to be resolved and get back on track.

Deputy Ott agreed to look at closing the meeting before it is brought back to the Board and agreed the concern about the time frame and keeping it short is in line with the NDE recommendation.

Member Jensen seconded member Melchers comments. If a closed session is held and where character and competence is considered, then statutorily the meeting could be closed and his initial thought is it should be closed. His second concern is the document references *the employer* and in a whistle blower situation often times it may not be an employer, but rather a co-worker. Earlier in the document the term used is *entity* or *school official*. He asked if the word *employer*

is appropriate. Deputy Canavero responded that is an error and is should be *entity* or *school official*.

Deputy Ott said he had enough information to re-draft the hearing procedures and bring it back to the October meeting.

Future Agenda Items

President Wynn remarked that the Board would like to have ongoing resting information updates. Teacher recruitment will also be brought back to the October meeting.

Member Serafin said for the CCSD HR report that will be coming to the Board, she asked that it not be just about full time hires, but also the substitute count. And they have the opportunity to focus on the schools that are part of the Governor's agenda, and to keep the Board updated about the achievement district.

Member Wakefield said there has been mention of the Nevada Plan in alignment with EL and also the shift the upcoming biennium modernize Nevada Plan. He asked if there is an item to get an understanding of that in their role of the Board. For SB 511, we have heard about the incentive portion and he would like to understand the work on the University side for the scholarship side. In particular, any

President Wynn reminded the Board that she likes to defer to the staff to keep them on track in a timely fashion and deal with the likes and wishes as they fall into place. If we do not get to everything, we keep it on our to do list until it becomes a must do list.

Public Comment #2

Ben Gerhardt, testing coordinator, Nevada Virtual Academy said as of right now there are still no SBAC results to analyze and 90 percent of his students participated in Smarter Balanced. It is disappointing as parents and teachers are calling to ask where are the SBAC scores and what is going on? He has put them off and tell them we only have testing data and grades from last year for teachers. He said he knows it is not the fault of the Board or superintendent. The sooner the scores come in the sooner the better. Also, Item 11, now that the entire state is using the ACT, he said asking the ACT people to come and discuss with the districts and schools at a deeper level digging into the data and not just looking at the base level and composite scores and bench marks, and digging in. Over the summer staff took the work keys, and it was amazing to see the results and it would be a worth while venture to further explore.

Member Jensen said on behalf of NASS, he expressed appreciation to Dale stating it has been a pleasure working with him the past two years and thanked him for all he has done.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.